

Chapter Seven GOALS, POLICIES, STRATEGIES, AND BARRIERS

Seven

Goals

Section 44-96-50 of the Solid Waste Policy and Management Act (**Act**) sets forth the State's reduction and recycling goals. The Act also states that each county or region meeting both goals be financially rewarded. At the time of last fiscal year's publication, the Act was in the process of being amended to include, in addition to other changes, a new recycling goal, a new reduction goal, and a definition of MSW. The proposed recycling goal would be based on MSW recycling efforts instead of total recycling efforts. The new reduction goal would be based on the amount of MSW generated per person, per day instead of the amount of solid waste being disposed of in the MSW landfills.

The Act was amended during the last fiscal year and the current reduction and recycling goals are based on EPA's definition of MSW, as defined in the EPA publication, *Characterization of Municipal Solid Waste in the United States*. According to this report, municipal solid waste includes wastes such as durable goods, non-durable goods, containers and packaging, food scraps, yard trimmings and miscellaneous inorganic wastes from residential, commercial, institutional and industrial sources. Examples of waste from these categories include appliances, automobiles tires, newspapers, clothing, boxes, disposable tableware, office and classroom paper, wood pallets and cafeteria wastes. MSW, according to this definition does not include waste from other sources, such as C&D, automobile bodies, municipal sludges, combustion ash and industrial process wastes that might also be disposed in MSW landfills or incinerators. While EPA identifies automobile tires as MSW, EPA does not consider the combustion of waste tires for fuel a form of recycling. EPA considers combustion a form of disposal. In contrast to EPA, South Carolina considers the combustion of waste tires for fuel a form of recycling.

The current reduction and recycling goals read, "It is the goal of this State to reduce, on a statewide per capita basis, the amount of *municipal* solid waste being generated to 3.5 pounds per day no later than June 30, 2005...It is the Goal of this State to recycle, on a statewide basis, at least 35% calculated by weight, of the *municipal* solid waste stream generated in this State no later than June 30, 2005."

The Department used the information submitted in the Annual Solid Waste Progress Reports to determine whether or not counties or regions met the established goals. Based on the information submitted for FY02, four counties met both MSW goals. The counties meeting both MSW goals for FY02 were Berkeley, Clarendon, Dorchester, and Lancaster. During FY01, four counties met both MSW goals. The counties meeting both goals for FY01 were Dorchester, Lancaster, Marlboro, and Williamsburg.

Reduction Goal.

Reduction is based on reducing the amount of *municipal* solid waste generated, statewide, to 3.5 pounds per person, per day.

The State's disposal rate is determined by converting the tonnage of MSW disposed of or incinerated in South Carolina into pounds, then dividing the amount of MSW disposed of/incinerated by 365 days. This figure is then divided by the State's population to derive the pounds of MSW disposed of per person, per day. Using the annual reports from the MSW landfills and MSW incinerators, South Carolina disposed of 4.2 pounds per person, per day for FY02. For FY01, South Carolina disposed of 4.23 pounds per person, per day.

FY98 was the first year the Department calculated the proposed generation rate using the EPA definition of MSW. Because of the differences in what is actually counted as MSW by EPA and what counties have historically counted as MSW, it was determined that it may take several years for the calculations to "level out" because of record keeping and problems associated with the separation of types of waste. Prior to FY98, counties were not asked to separate their waste stream in this manner.

Based on the MSW reduction goal of 3.5 pounds per person, per day, 23 counties met the goal for FY02. The counties meeting the reduction goal for FY02 were Abbeville, Aiken, Allendale, Berkeley, Calhoun, Chester, Chesterfield, Clarendon, Darlington, Dorchester, Edgefield, Kershaw, Lancaster, Laurens, Lexington, Marlboro, McCormick, Oconee, Pickens, Saluda, Sumter, Union, and Williamsburg. Twenty counties met the goal for FY01. The State's reduction rate for FY02 was 4.2 pounds per person per day. The reduction rate was 4.23 for FY01. [Refer to Chapter Ten, Table 10.4, for specific information on the reduction efforts for each county.](#)

Recycling Goal.

Recycling efforts are based on recycling, on a statewide basis, at least 35% of the *municipal* solid waste stream.

The State's recycling rate is based on the "defined MSW" recycling efforts (residential/county, commercial, institutional/non-profit, and industrial packaging/administrative), the total amount of "defined MSW" landfilled and incinerated, and the amount of MSW generated ("defined MSW" recycled plus "defined MSW" disposed of – landfilled/incinerated). The State's recycling rate is equal to the amount of MSW recycled divided by the amount of MSW generated, multiplied by 100.

Ten counties met the 35% MSW recycling goal for FY02. During FY01, nine counties met the recycling goal. The counties meeting the 35% MSW recycling goal for FY02 were Anderson, Berkeley, Charleston, Clarendon, Dorchester, Greenville, Greenwood, Jasper, Lancaster, and Marion. The counties meeting the goal during FY01 were Berkeley, Charleston, Dorchester, Greenville, Jasper, Lancaster, Marion, Marlboro, and Williamsburg. South Carolina's MSW recycling rate was 28.96%. [Refer to Chapter Ten, Table 10.4, for specific information on the recycling efforts for each county.](#)

Policies

Section 44-96-50 of the Act outlines five policies for South Carolina. Based on these policies, the Department has: issued grants to local governments; designed public education programs; developed and implemented solid waste management regulations; and, encouraged solid waste management planning.

Strategies

The Department emphasizes the following strategies with regard to the improvements of solid waste management in the state: source reduction, reuse, recycling, composting and regionalization. In developing these strategies, public education, technical assistance, financial incentives and planning are just a few of the activities that will assist local governments with these strategies. As a result of the state plan being rewritten, counties have been requested to ensure all local plans are consistent with the 1999 State Solid Waste Management Plan. As the counties and/or regions consider revisions and continue to implement their local solid waste management plans, existing strategies will be examined.

The incentive, as defined by the Act, is to reduce the amount of solid waste being disposed and increase the amount being recycled. To increase participation, counties continue to educate the citizens and implemented convenient centers or curbside collection to remove barriers from participation in recycling programs. Charleston, Chester, Chesterfield, Darlington and Horry counties have some type of volume-based fees, or "pay-as-you-throw" or "variable rate pricing" within the respective county. However, perhaps the single greatest asset for any county to increase the recycling rate is local businesses and industry. Forming a contact with local businesses and industries that have recycling programs continued to be a tremendous asset to the counties during the fiscal year. Counties that were successful in obtaining this information were able to apply the administrative and packaging recycling efforts of local businesses and industry toward the counties efforts in meeting the goals.

Total recycling efforts of the counties (not used to calculate rates associated with the solid waste goals) are drastically impacted by local industry recycling efforts. While industry's recycling efforts do not contribute towards an individual county's success in meeting the recycling goal, the pre-consumer recycling efforts can inflate (or deflate) the total recycling efforts for any given fiscal year. For example, during FY00, Richland County's total solid waste recycling was almost 2 million tons and York County's

total solid waste recycling was almost 1.5 million tons as a result of industry recycling efforts. For FY00, there were 8.7 million tons of solid waste recycled with industry contributing 7.4 million tons to the total solid waste stream recycled. In contrast, 3.5 million tons of the total solid waste stream were recycled for FY01. Of this, industrial pre-consumer efforts contributed 1.1 million tons. Only Charleston County reported recycling almost 1 million tons of the total solid waste stream for FY01.

For FY01, industry recycled 0.6 million tons of administrative/packaging material and 1.1 million tons of pre-consumer/processed wastes. Industry contributed 1.7 million tons of the 3.5 million tons of the total recycling efforts of the State. Industrial efforts made up 49% of the total solid waste recycling efforts for FY01.

For FY02, there were 4,955,088 tons of solid waste recycled. Industry accounted for 66% (3,278,989 tons) of the total solid waste stream recycled. Eighty-six percent of the industrial recycling effort was preconsumer/processing waste with 14% coming from industrial packaging/administrative recycling efforts. Charleston County made up 47% (2,307,548 tons) of total solid waste recycling for South Carolina. Almost 2 million tons of Charleston County's total recycling was from industrial preconsumer/processing recycling efforts.

The total recycling rates for the past several fiscal years are shown in Table 7.0. Refer to Chapter Ten, Tables [10.3](#) and [10.4](#), for specific information on the total recycling and MSW recycling efforts of the counties and State.

| Table 7.0 Total Solid Waste Recycling Efforts by Fiscal Year | |
|--|------------------|
| Fiscal Year | Percent Recycled |
| 2002 | 43% |
| 2001 | 35% |
| 2000 | 53% |
| 1999 | 45% |
| 1998 | 42% |
| 1997 | 34% |
| 1996 | 27% |
| 1995 | 16% |

Barriers

Several barriers continue to "hold over" from year to year. The lack of available markets and prices for commodities continues to threaten most recycling programs. In addition, limited funding for the Solid Waste Grant program inhibits recycling and reduction assistance.

The Department continues to explore options to replenish the solid waste funds so the Solid Waste Grant program may continue. Refer to [Chapter Nine](#) for a detailed summary of all grant programs.